IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

WEDNESDAY, THE NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI DEVINDER GUPTA,THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.SESHASAYANA REDDY

WRIT APPEAL NO : 231 of 2005

(Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the Order dated 03/02/2005 in W.P.M.P.No.1962 of 2005 in WP NO : 1469 of 2005 on the file of the High Court.)

Between:

M/s.Pallava Granites Industries (India)

Private Limited, having its Regd.Office

At No.10, Sriram Nagar North Street,

Alwarpet, Chennai – 600 018, rep. By its

Managing Director, Sri K.Subba Reddy,

S/o.Late K.RadhaKrishna Reddy, age 53 years,

R/o.Chennai.

..... APPELLANT

AND

1. The Special Chief Secretary,

Government of Andhra Pradesh,

Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.

2. The Government of Andhra Pradesh,

rep. By its Secretary, Industries and

Commerce Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.

3. The Director of Mines and Geology,

Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

4. The Assistant Director of Mines and Geology,

Ongole, Prakasham District.

5. Andhra Pradesh Mineral Development,

Corporation, Hyderabad, rep. By its

Managing Director.

.....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Appellant: SMT. N.SHOBA
Counsel for Respondent NO.1: THE ADVOCATE GENERAL
Counsel for Respondent Nos.2 to 5:MR. A.SUDERSHAN REDDY

The Court at the admission stage made the following

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

ORDER: (Per Sri Devinder Gupta,CJ)

The writ petition filed by the appellant was admitted by the learned single Judge but WPMP No.1962 of 2005 was dismissed as infructuous in view of the statement made by the learned Government Pleader that pursuant to the order impugned in the writ petition, consequential proceedings had already been issued by the 1st respondent on 1.2.2005. The petitioner-appellant is not aggrieved by this order saying that there are further steps which can be taken by the 5th respondent and therefore, all further proceedings has to be stayed.

As a matter of fact, the prayer made in the WPMP itself was vague. Whenever any applicant has to ask for a relief, it must be a specific one. Under the impugned proceedings, which are under challenge in the writ petition, Director of Mines and

Geology, Hyderabad had to take necessary action in the matter. The Director of Mines and Geology, Hyderabad has taken further action and the lease having been granted to the 5th respondent, further action in so far as the impugned proceedings are concerned stood to have been taken and the prayer made in the writ petition was rendered infructuous. In that view of the matter, no interference is called for in this appeal. However, in case, the appellant wants some further interim relief, it may be for the petitioner-appellant to approach the learned single Judge afresh in accordance with law.

_____

DEVINDER GUPTA, CJ

Dated 09.02.2005

_____

B.SESHASAYANA REDDY,J

To

1. The Special Chief Secretary,
Government of Andhra Pradesh,
Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.

2. The Secretary, Government of Andhra Pradesh,
Industries and Commerce Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.

3. The Director of Mines and Geology,
Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

4. The Assistant Director of Mines and Geology,
Ongole, Prakasham District.

5. The Managing Director, Andhra Pradesh Mineral Development, Corporation, Hyderabad.

6. Two CCs to the Advocate General, High Court of A.P, Hyderabad(O.U.T).

7. Two CD copies.